

CDC Information Council (CIC)
Meeting Minutes
March 28, 2002, 3:30p.m.-5:00p.m.
Roybal Campus, Bldg., 16, Room 5126

CDC Information Council met on March 28, 2002, Roybal Campus, Building 16, Room 5126 at 3:30p.m. Janet Collins and John Loonsk co-chaired the meeting.

Updates: (Janet Collins and John Loonsk)

- Future CIC Meetings

CIC members agreed that future CIC meetings would be held on the last Thursday of every month from 3:00p.m. - 5:00p.m.

- Follow-up Evaluation of IHSIS (Janet Collins)

Janet Collins will facilitate the process of interfacing the OD with AIDS to investigate IHSIS compliance with NEDSS standards. The goal is to be expeditious and focused by being precise and short in time while getting essential information about compliance of IHSIS with NEDSS standards. The process will involve focusing on the functional implications of noncompliance and what it would take if functional implications have functional limitations, to address these in terms of time, effort and resources.

Janet explained that this is just one piece of information, which will feed into decision-making. There are a number of programmatic issues, which will feed into decisions about the IHSIS system. This is just one of the issues and the goal is to stay focused

Comments:

Jim Buehler commented that he is looking forward to getting the process underway. He questioned, "What is the process and are we in agreement with the NEDSS standards?" He also asked, "What is the process for deciding whether or not something is adherent to the standards?" and "What is the role of this oversight committee in the governance of NEDSS?"

John Loonsk commented that this issue relates to how we manage enterprise IT standards and specifications like the BT standards and how this group relates to the NEDSS standards and specifications as well as others. He commented that the process is not nailed down.

- NEDSS Change Control Process (Claire Broome)

Claire Broome discussed an update on the NEDSS change control process, which was circulated to CIC before the last meeting. The comments that were received were incorporated. Claire indicated that some of the comments related to broader NEDSS issues. These included:

1. Priority setting for program area module (PAM) development
2. Approaches to program area module development
3. Issues that relate to how CDC identifies and adopts standards (in a generic sense)

Claire suggests that these may be issues, which CIC may want to put on a future agenda. Other comments were incorporated and underlined in the PowerPoint presentation. She talked specifically about two different issues around the Change Control board. These included:

1. The composition of the membership for the Change Control board
2. The question of whether or not there should be an appeal process

It was suggested that there were 3 ways this could be handled.

1. There could be an appeal process at which time there would be program input
2. Neutral representation on Change Control Board, meaning that it would include a representative from a program that doesn't get data from a NEDSS based system.
3. Change Control Board would include a representative from the program initiating the change. If this is the case, how do you select, charge, etc?

The NEDSS revised Change Control Process PowerPoint will be distributed electronically to CIC for further comments.

Comments:

Bob Pinner asked about the issue of scope of the Change Control Process.

Claire Broome commented that this process is focused only on the NEDSS Base System,

Bob Pinner indicated that he would like to see the NEDSS Base System differentiated from PAM's. He thinks that if the scope encompasses PAM's then it needs further discussion. He wants assurance that any PAM development would not impact the Base System and invoke this process. He also commented that he would like program judgment at the program level so that it is possible to argue for or against the process.

John Loonsk asked if we agreed that the PAMs are in scope of this process?

David Fleming stated that if it was not important to get program input into the base system, then it wouldn't matter who is participating. He felt that since the issue was raised, the group thinks that it is possible that architecture of the base system would affect the programs.

Claire Broome added that the base system interfaces very closely with PAM's so the programs have been paying a lot of attention to how the base system is evolving. She thinks that it is important to recognize with both the Change Review Panel and the Change Control Board, there is an opportunity for the programs to make a case for why they think it is important.

Denise Koo raised the issue of how to make sure that CSC understands the issue when evaluating the change and how to insure that the analysis is appropriate.

Claire Broome indicated that the intent is to have extensive open documentation.

Steve Hinrichs asked, "How do partners in the states address overall architecture.

Claire Broome explained that she wants to have group feedback sessions in a number of formats. The new version of the proposal includes state and local partner representation on the Change Review Process and the Change Review Board.

Bob Pinner indicated that he construes this as a narrow focus and believes that consensus is possible.

Janet Collins commented that there might need to be informal working groups between sessions, which can focus on these types of issues and bring forward the topics to the table.

- Process for BT Specifications (John Loonsk)

John Loonsk described that this agenda item refers to the process for BT specifications. The specifications that have gone out with the BT guidance refers to data specifications and technical specifications. These data and technical specifications are not completely defined; overall they reference 85-95% of what needs to be specified for BT detection and response. There are a few key areas, which are not specified.

A process has been identified for how to do these specifications within the next few months. The focus areas are an extension to NEDSS data models in certain BT categories. The process includes looking at the following broad functional focus areas:

1. Specimen and collection for exchange between public health partners- environmental and human samples
2. Critical BT data for contact tracing data- how to deal with exposures
3. Directory schema for public health - wants to come to closure
4. Syndromic data, alert messaging- want to do formal modeling for alert messaging to match to a directory structure

The process is underway to identify a formal data modeler and a program co-lead. John asked people to identify people from the CIO's with relationship to these areas and any external participants who might be interested in reviewing and nailing down the specifications. He would like to have as much participation as possible to review the specifications before the May 8th working group meeting. He is eager to come to closure and get people to the table. This will also be presented at the broader NEDSS Stakeholder's meeting on May 9 and 10.

Agenda Item #1: CTOC Working Group- Hot Site (Jaspal Sagoo)

Jaspal explained that the Hot Site Working Group was charged with making recommendations for a redundant "hot site (s)" for the Atlanta Metropolitan Area and remote campuses, and to develop guidelines/standards for data center disaster recovery. The purpose of a hot site is to allow a CIO whose data center is inoperable to be running with their key systems, in a short period of time. The work group considered several options:

1. Mutual agreement between the CIO's and IRMO, where IRMO would allocate space for each CIO at Building 16 to host key systems, providing the CIO's with a centralized hot site infrastructure: in return, each CIO would allocate space for IRMO at different campuses to host key systems, providing IRMO with a decentralized hot site infrastructure.
2. A hot site (preferably on CDC owned or leased space), located off-site, where all CIO's could host their key equipment and systems, using a storage area network (SAN) as the central repository for the data the CIO's would need to access.
3. To outsource the entire hot site or hosting services only to a vendor that specializes in hot sites. This option includes two different scenarios. One, which includes fully-hosted vendor services and the other, which is vendor-provided hosting service with CDC-owned equipment

Jaspal discussed the cost estimates of each option. Both the vendors and the cost estimates are listed along with the services provided in the work group report provided. The specific vendor names and costs are not listed here for confidentiality reasons. Please refer to the handouts for more information.

A review of the options describes the reasons for the final recommendation. Option number one was ruled out because this scenario called for distributed hot site redundancy, where servers and storage would be spread out among the Clifton Building 16, and Metro Atlanta campuses. Because of increased cost and space constraints, and minimum

distance recommendations, this option was not recommended. Option number two which called for a hot site in a central CDC-owned or leased space was ruled out for three reasons.

1. Clifton 21 is not online, and housing the host site in building 16, would not provide disaster protection for services emanating from Clifton and Clifton residents.
2. It does not meet minimum distance recommendations
3. There would be difficulty in procuring sufficient leased space for an additional data center.

The working group recommended option number three as a final choice. Jaspal described the recommendation for both the fully-hosted and for the host facility only scenarios. These are listed on the last page of the handout.

Comments:

Bob Pinner asked several questions about the different vendors. He wanted to know why there was such a big cost difference and whether there were hidden costs with the fully hosted vendor.

Jaspal answered that one vendor provided everything and would not be flexible while the other was willing to work in our space. He indicated that all issues were addressed.

Jim Seligman discussed a long time good standing in the mainframe arena with one of the vendors, which is being recommended for a fully hosted site.

Does the estimate included technology refreshment?

If they were providing equipment, we would be locked into a three-year contract.

What additional capacity would each CIO need to plug into this?"

Every CIO has submitted a list of key systems and key personnel as well.

What would the cost be for each CIO?"

There would be three full time people to work with the CIO's; if the CIO's didn't have additional requirements there would be no additional cost.

Charlie Rothwell commented that people should think more broadly about this subject. During an Anthrax scare at the Hyattsville facility, everything was turned off and there was nowhere to move. He also felt like there are other things to think about such as, Citrix capability from everyone's home. One other point Charlie made included considering other sites and whether or not they are covered as well.

Jaspal commented that other sites have been taken into consideration.

John Loonsk explained that there are issues around how information systems that are implemented at a remote site are secured under our common security infrastructure and manifest in our common DNS structure. He indicated that something needed to be done

about this short term because we are not where we need to be for critical systems. Some programs have started to do hot sites in different places, which has caused problems relative to putting them under the same security umbrella. He also commented that all systems are not equal and the process was to identify critical systems and tease out important differences.

Jim Seligman discussed the concept of critical systems. He indicated that there is a gradation of criticality, which takes into account the critical systems in a tier type of process. It involves careful consideration of what is always necessary for operation and what can be down for a day or two. He also indicated that Congress appropriated six million dollars for data reliability and sustainability and for buying storage capacity. Jim felt that some of this money could be used for this purpose.

John Loonsk indicated that we should develop networking with Chamblee. He stated that we are currently more dependent on Clifton than we should be.

Some examples of critical systems include HAN, Epi X, the secure data network, email infrastructure and anything related to BT. These would be in a tier one.

John Loonsk suggested that the CDC website itself should be tiered.

Heidi Steele questioned again the difference in the cost estimates. She would like more specific information about what is and is not provided by the services.

Jeanne Gilliland commented that the option with the most flexibility should be the recommended choice.

John Loonsk indicated that the funding to support this level of hot site has not been identified.

Should we charge the group to do this?

John Loonsk commented that he thinks that there needs to be a smaller scope, a review of highly critical systems and some additional work done on the cost.

Jim Seligman suggested continuing with option three and identifying tiering.

John Loonsk added that he feels it is time to move out of the committee process. He would like to see a greater definition of the criticality matrix and to get input from CIC relative to evaluation of criticality.

Charlie Rothwell indicated a need too consider the partners in the states when looking at critical systems.

John Loonsk stated that IRMO could provide identification of critical systems. He indicated that work would be done to get a CIO list of critical systems. He suggested a review of the list, getting more specific pricing for each tier and then looking at funding.

Due to time constraints, the additional agenda items were not presented. Janet Collins suggested extending the CIC meetings to a two-hour time period. Everyone agreed that this would be beneficial.

Attendees:

Members/Alternates
Claire Broome (OD)
Jim Buehler (NCHSTP)
Janet Collins (NCCDPHP)
Ed Dacey (NIOSH)
David Fleming (OD)
Jeanne Gilliland (NCCDPHP)
John Horan (NCIPC)-phone
Ed Hunter
Nabil Issa - phone
Debbie Jones (PHPPO)
Denise Koo (EPO)
John Loonsk (IRMO)
Tonya Martin (NCHSTP)-phone
Mike Perry (ATSDR)
Robert Pinner (NCID)
Charles Rothwell (NCHS)-envision
Jaspal Sagoo (NCHSTP)
Heidi Steele (NIP)
Jim Seligman (OD)

Partners:

Steve Hinrichs (APHL)-envision

Others:

Andrew Autry (NCBDDD)
Laura Conn (IRMO) - phone
Mike Donnelly (OH-IHIS)
Suzanne Mabee (NCHSTP)
Barbara Nichols (IRMO)
Marc Safran (NCHSTP)